

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-10, 13-14, and 17-22 are pending in this application. Claims 10, and 17 have been amended, claims 11-12 and 15-16 have been cancelled and claims 20-22 have been added. In view of this Amendment reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gosper. Further claims 7-9 were rejected as obvious over Gosper in view of Douglas. Applicant traverses the Examiner's finding of obviousness and believes the cited art does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Gosper teaches a different method of determining a valid polygon. As admitted by the Examiner, Gosper does not use an overlap interval for the determination. It seems the Examiner's argument is that one of ordinary skill could just do it with the method of Gosper. That is true, but that is irrelevant to the issue of patentability. Gosper uses endpoint calculations to determine crossover. The calculations take a number of operations, and the determination of crossover may not be determined until the operations are complete. In contrast, the present invention uses a different method and does not directly determine crossover from calculations using the endpoints.

Claim 10 has been amended to include further limitations. Basis for these changes can be found on pages 6-7 of the specification. The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest the invention as claimed. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/035,111  
Amdt. dated 02/12/2004  
Reply to Office action of 11/10/2003

Respectfully submitted,

Texas Instruments Incorporated

By   
Bret J. Petersen  
Reg. No. 37,417  
Tel.: (972) 917-5339